

NEW YORK JOURNAL AND ADVERTISER.

W. R. HEARST.

AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MR. HILL'S POLITICAL PROGRAMME.

David B. Hill in the Journal of yesterday outlined the policy which, in his opinion, the Democratic party of New York must adopt if it shall hope to win success this Fall. There may be divergence of opinion upon this or that plank in the platform he suggests. Out of differing views and the interchange of opinion political truth proceeds. Therefore the veteran leader of the Democratic party of the State of New York has done his party and the commonwealth the greatest possible service by putting forth frankly his conception of the issues upon which the Democracy shall seek success in the State this Fall.

The public man who dares to clearly and openly express his convictions is the man to whom voters can turn with confidence. The days of mystery, evasion and secrecy in politics are past. An intelligent electorate has a right to know what its leaders think upon the issues which its vote is to determine. It has a right to know before platforms are adopted what are the views of the men who ask of the voters the delegated right to frame those platforms.

Senator Hill suggests these points as matters fit to engage the attention of the Democratic State Convention:

FIRST—The repeal of the infamous Raines law, and the enactment of a just and comprehensive Excise law, liberal in its provisions, reasonable in its exactions, administered by local authorities instead of the present huge political State machine, composed of Republican State officials, and its revenues applied to local purposes to reduce local taxation instead of being directed to State purposes.

SECOND—Genuine and honest home rule for cities. Not one kind of legislation for Democratic cities and another kind for Republican cities.

THIRD—The repeal of the Black Force law, recently enacted. Uniform election laws throughout the State, enforced by local officials everywhere. Equal rights and equal citizenship for all the electors of the State.

FOURTH—Opposition to unnecessary special legislation. A material reduction of the volume of our annual laws and a return to the principles of general legislation, practically abandoned for the past four years.

FIFTH—An honest administration of the canals of the State. No squandering of the public money. Contracts to be fairly let to the lowest bona-fide bidder. A reduction of canal expenditures, and the work of carrying on further canal improvements not to be entrusted to Republican officials responsible for the prodigality, favoritism and corruption which have characterized the present administration of the canals.

SIXTH—A fair and just enforcement of the State Civil Service laws, according to their letter and spirit. The Soldier Preference law to be impartially executed, and soldiers' rights restored without regard to political affiliations.

SEVENTH—Economy in public expenditures. A low taxation rate, as was during the administration of Democratic Governors from 1883 to 1895. A reduction of salaries increased and the abolition of commissions unnecessarily created during the four years of the Republican rule.

EIGHTH—Honest men for public office; corruptionists and lobbyists to be reared. Opposition to the alliance for corrupt purposes of the State Government with certain corrupt corporations, and the abolition of the brazen front of an administration which puts forth as the personal representative of the Governor a person who is notoriously the hireling of such corporations as find it necessary or profitable to influence legislation, even into the executive chamber.

NINTH—Freedom of the press as guaranteed by the Constitution. No Ellisworth Newspaper bill, abridging the right of the press as expressed since the organization of the government. No gag law.

TENTH—The restoration of the National Guard to that high standing and efficiency which it enjoyed under Democratic administrations, especially under the Adjutant-Generalship of General Josiah Porter, and before it was demoralized, humiliated and injured through the incompetency, blundering and indifference of the present military management of Governor Black and his Adjutant-General.

ELEVENTH—An amendment to the Constitution providing for biennial sessions of the Legislature, thereby promoting economy, reducing the volume of legislation and better conserving the interests of the people.

This is the legislative programme of a statesman. Read in connection with Mr. Hill's very explicit interview in the Journal of yesterday it amounts to a text book for the guidance of the New York Democracy in State affairs.

A WORD FOR

AGUINALDO.

Aguineldo, it is represented, is making himself troublesome.

Admiral Dewey has not said so; neither has General Merritt. Aguinaldo seems to be giving offense chiefly to those who regard his military successes as presumptuous.

No doubt this Philippine soldier is far from being a meek person. Quite probably his triumphs over the Spaniards have greatly elated him and much increased his sense of his importance. Also it is likely that, having proved his mettle and possessing a victorious army, he thinks he is entitled to be consulted when the future government of his country is being discussed.

There is every reason to believe that Aguinaldo considers he has a better right to be considered and consulted on that head than any Spaniard living, not excepting Sagasta, Weyler or the King of Spain.

Aguineldo is only a Philippine and lives at a long distance from ourselves, but let us, nevertheless, endeavor to use common sense and a little manly generosity in judging him.

He has done a patriot's duty in the field, he has defeated in numerous battles an enemy that offered a price for his head, and he has indubitably earned the right to a voice in the settlement of the fate of his native land.

Aguineldo, gold collar and all, would be an incomparably more creditable partner for the United States in the Philippines than Spain, which, impotent now as concerns us, is eager for vengeance upon Aguinaldo and all rebels against her thievish and murderous tyranny.

THE DEATH OF BISMARCK.

In Bismarck a great man has gone, unquestionably. Modern times have known no stronger individual force. He had a capacious brain, an iron will, and no illusions of the kind that tend to restrain action along the path at the end of which is to be seen a desired object. When power was his he used it like a broadsword. He was the intellect and the arm of the able Emperor whom he served and loved. Bismarck was instrumental in the accomplishment of a great work, the unification of the German people, and while

NO PARTNERSHIP WITH SPAIN.

To give Spain any voice whatever in the settlement of what shall be done with the Philippines would be a mistake. Her participation could only increase the difficulties of the situation.

Better that the United States should withdraw Dewey's ships and Merritt's troops and wash its hands of the entire business, making Dewey's victory a barren feat of war, and Merritt's expedition the conspicuous and costly proof of an abandoned purpose.

It is impossible to restore the status quo ante, but our withdrawal would be the most that we could do toward that end, unless we should lend to Spain our ships and soldiers to reconquer the revolted people.

Unquestionably the situation presents many problems and embarrassments at best—and at best means American possession. That straightforward and courageous course would at least command the world's respect and inspire ultimate peace and good government for the Philippines.

To accept Spain's partnership is to make certain these consequences:

1. The distrust of American good faith by the natives and contempt for our power.
2. The keeping alive of all the discontents, hatreds and quarrels growing out of Spanish rule.

The elimination of Spain would rid the situation of this whole hideous legacy of troubles and bring the people of the islands face to face with a new power, having upon their gratitude the claim of being Spain's expeller, and possessing the prestige of the strength betokened by Dewey's destruction of the Spanish fleet.

To co-operate with Spain is to keep open a running sore—to postpone the act of surgery from which alone a cure is to be expected. Spain learns nothing from experience. Her whole colonial history demonstrates that. Leave her an atom of authority in the Philippines and she will abuse it. Spain will be Spanish everywhere and always. What we have the opportunity to do now without serious opposition—to evict her utterly—we may have to do at the cost of another war hereafter if we allow her a foothold in the Philippines.

If generosity is the motive that prompts the Administration not to demand from Spain the unconditional surrender of the islands, it is a mistaken kindness. Other nations will hunger for what we resign, and prostrate Spain cannot resist the mighty hand grabbers that are dividing China among them. Shall we agree to defend Spain, the oppressor of the Philippines, against the attack of any European power which may choose to endeavor to despoil her? Are the American people prepared to have the Republic play such a role? If there is any fighting to be done for the Philippines, why not stand ready to do it for ourselves?

It is proposed to retain Manila, Cavite, the bay and its environs for a naval station. That, in one sense, is better than nothing, but with Spain for a partner we make inevitable the enmity of the natives and guarantee for ourselves more trouble with foreign powers than if we should sail away and retain nothing.

The statesmanship which postpones is the parent of endless trouble. It has given us this war. It may give us more than one war as the result of nerveless paltering in the Philippines. The right thing, the safe thing to do, is to be bold then.

But, policy aside, to fail of our clear duty to reap the full harvest sown by Dewey would be a crime. We are now morally responsible to mankind for the future of those islands. We have warred on Spain at Manila, destroyed her ships, armed her rebellious colonists against her, and by our acts assumed sovereignty. We have imposed upon ourselves inescapable obligations.

To ourselves and to the world we owe the completion of the work of liberation. The returning of the natives to Spanish rule, in whole or in part, would be on a par with the restoration to his master of a runaway slave whom we had helped to escape and inflamed with the just hope of free manhood. It is proposed that we shall render the Republic infamous.

The necessity of war carried us to the Philippines. The fortune of war gave us a victory that electrified the world. Our coming was a promise of liberty to a robbed, a goaded, a desperate people. Our flag was the promise of Spain's expulsion forever.

Are we now to cheat this people? To turn aside from the plain path of duty? To make an exhibition of irresolution and feebleness that will go far to remove from Europe's mind the profound and useful impression of our might, stamped by the victories of Dewey and Schley and our soldiers at Santiago? To descend to partnership with Spain in imposing upon a brave people a hateful rule? To be false to our high mission as a nation, which is to extend liberty and self-government throughout the earth as God sends opportunity?

The American people will not consent to abandonment of the Philippines. They will not consent to the degradation of a partnership with Spain in oppression. They will not consent to the nullification of Dewey's victory.

The American people will dictate the terms of peace with Spain. The American people have the courage to grapple with new problems, however difficult, and they desire first of all to be right, to be American.

The Senate is still to be heard from.

force and power. And he was a man, withal—frank, vigorous, above pretences, bitter in his humor and scornful of ideas which were opposed to his own.

Bismarck was no friend to liberty, no believer in republicanism. He was utterly without faith in the capacity of the common people to grow equal to the burden of self-government. He really belonged to the past. Had circumstances placed him in an age when valor and capacity could have won a throne Bismarck would have worn a crown and ruled his subjects well. But they would have been his subjects. All malcontents would have felt the halter draw.

This great German was not fortunate in the close of the drama of his career. With the entrance of the young Emperor—who felt that he would be overshadowed were he to retain in service his grandfather's minister and master—Bismarck was forced to leave the stage of action and sit among the spectators.

So much ability, so much virility could not accept retirement with docility nor enact with dignity the role of the recluse. He was a lion caged, and his growls echoed through the world.

There have been greater men than Bismarck, and better, but there has died with him so much strength and individuality, his name is associated with so much that shines out in the century's history, that his going causes a pervasive sense of loss. Still he had done his work, for good and ill, and his later years were but an empty waiting for the end.

No man is so great that the world cannot spare him, and the masses of men, struggling slowly and painfully up to self-knowledge and self-government, cannot count the Bismarcks, large or little, as helpers and friends.

PUBLISH DEWEY'S DISPATCH.

A press telegram from Washington says:

A cable dispatch from Admiral Dewey indicates that about 150,000 United States troops will be needed to reconquer the insurgents throughout the Philippine Islands to American rule.

The Journal respectfully asks for the publication of Admiral Dewey's dispatch. Had its contents been of a character to support the Administration's policy of a partnership with Spain in the Philippines, the cablegram, it is reasonable to assume, would have been given out in full.

Perhaps the Admiral, who has had unsurpassed opportunities for judging the courage and intelligence of the Philippines, has wired the Administration that if American rule is to go hand-in-hand with Spanish rule not less than 150,000 soldiers will be necessary to crush them into submission.

And the more soldiers required to force the Philippines to re-enter Spanish slavery, even with American modifications, the more honor to their manhood.

But American soldiers will never be employed in such evil work. The American people will see to that.

Meantime let us have Admiral Dewey's dispatch. Nobody believes that he is the kind of man who wants to see the United States acting as Spain's partner for the coercion of a people that have fought and shed their blood to free themselves from Spanish tyranny. Admiral Dewey is not built on those lines.

A SAD CRY FROM MADRID.

In shedding little American blood. This to the Herald is like "hot iron in the flesh."

It is true that the Spaniards are singular enemies in war, though it has to be admitted hard. For instance, they fired resolutely at those who were being carried to the

fighting around Santiago raged, and they poured in their bullets upon our field hospitals. And from Porto Rico reports come that there is some brave and honorable poisoning of wells to meet the American advance upon San Juan.

The prospect of a speedy peace should cheer the downcast Herald. It is in peace that the Spaniards are most deadly to Americans.

Remember the Maine.

CONDENSED EDITORIALS.

MR. VANDERBILT and Mr. Croker came home together on the Lucania. She was delayed on account of an unusually heavy fog. It was a fog which caused the Bourgogne disaster.

Suppose the Lucania had met the same fate as the French liner?

Could the business and statesmanship of the United States have survived the shock?

It is a tremendous thought.

MUCH ADVICE, and a good deal of it not valuable, is coming to the United States from the press of England.

The London Spectator thinks it inadmissible to grant independence to the Cubans, and holds that we should break the "injurious pledge of Congress."

This is the United States, not England—a Republic, not a monarchy.

It would be easy to break a pledge to a weak nation, but the very fact that a nation is weak enforces the obligation to keep our given word, whether it be injudicious to do so or not.

That is the dictate of American honor.

But keeping faith with the Cubans is not injudicious. It is always good policy to do right.

OUR SOLDIERS IN CUBA are fighting now against a more demoralized, and, perhaps, a more deadly foe than the Spaniards—yellow fever.

How has the scourge made such headway that thousands of our men are down with it?

Responsibility rests somewhere, and that responsibility must be fixed. The American people will demand that this be done.

"THE PHILIPPINES," telegraphs ex-Minister Barrett to the Journal, "look forward to a Philippine republic under the protection of the United States."

Presumptuous dream! Spain, if admitted to partnership with the United States, would soon teach these madly aspiring natives that liberty is not for them.

IS DEWEY'S VICTORY to result in anarchy for the Philippines?

That must be the consequence of a partnership effort of Spain and the United States to force the natives back under Spanish rule.

No promises that Spain can make will be believed by the Philippines. They know Spain.

AN EX-CHIEF OF POLICE of Muskegon, Mich., has been convicted of a mercenary murder in Chicago and will hang.

His duties in Muskegon made him familiar with crime and he profited by his knowledge in the same fashion as those shrewd and enterprising spirits do who study Henry George's books in order to learn how the community can be plundered.

But in the case of the ex-Chief of Police a rope goes with the "unearned increment," and that is discouraging.

AGUINALDO'S GOLD COLLAR offends the practical American mind—even the minds of the Colonels and Judges who never fought or sat on the bench.

The gold collar is absurd, of course, but a man who has worn the Spanish yoke all his life naturally feels that he must have something around his neck.

SPAIN'S LUCK will stagger her. She never expected to be offered such terms of peace. A joint commission to decide about the future government of the Philippines, no indemnity, and not a word about the Maine, is a cloudburst of unlooked-for good fortune.

DRUD-SCOTT DECISION ought not to apply as a precedent in American action in the Philippines.

Have freed the islands, and they will remain free. Let them and make friends with their late Spanish masters. Spain is cruelty to her desperate exiles.

BISMARCK ESTIMATED BY EUROPEAN MINDS.

Praise and Censure from Henry M. Stanley, Jules Simon, Juliette Adam, Anton Von Werner, Georg Brandes, Frederick Passy and Others.

BISMARCK'S WORK

CONVULSED EUROPE.

I am not an admirer of Prince Bismarck, but I will try to give an unbiased opinion as possible.

Above all, he was an eminent, practical politician, and as such towered high above all his contemporaries. I doubt whether he would have conceived the idea of Germany's unification if it had not been there before him. He was not one of those creative geniuses who produce great ideas and give them to the world. But if there had been no Bismarck the unification of Germany would probably have remained a dream. He made it a fact.

Cavour alone has rivalled Bismarck in cleverness for carrying out and endowing with life ideas upheld by the nation. But Cavour got outside help and his life's work did not convulse Europe as Bismarck's. He did not create so great a power as Germany is, either. In this respect Bismarck was the first man of the century.

Bismarck was incomparable in the matter of making the most of men, things and accidents. He took hold of everything that came along, and knew not only how to handle events favorable to him, avoiding collisions, but turned everything happening to his advantage. In this respect he showed great creative power.

His methods were startling. In his character he united qualities that were seemingly opposed to each other: Impudence and the greatest forthright; he was candid and Jesuitical at the same time. He never loved truth, but once in a while told the truth as other people tell lies off and on. This stratagem of his often deceived an enemy.

The structure he erected was artificial and well finished off, but at the same time appeared not unlike a Cyclopean piece of architecture. His great and clever giant's fist showed in every one of his acts. He loved power and he made the most of it. He perfected power. He welded together Germany, hammer in hand, and never hesitated to let his hammer descend upon German heads when necessary.

After the dismissal of the Chancellor, a certain French bishop asked: "What would become of us if this powerful Germany were as good as she is powerless?"

I make answer: Bismarck's Germany cannot be good.

Many Germans loved and admired Bismarck; they acknowledge that the unification of the Fatherland was his work, but they recognized also, long ago, that Germany could not continue to live under his guidance.

HENRYK SIENKIEWICZ.

BISMARCK NOT A GREAT MAN.

I fully understand and appreciate why the Prussians think Bismarck the greatest of men. He created Germany. On the other hand, I ask myself: Has Bismarck done one good action in his long life? He had time enough, God gave him time enough, to become a benefactor of humanity. The higher the place upon which he stood, the easier was it for him to do good. Perhaps others know of Bismarck's good deeds; I do not. I know that he dethroned the poor, blind King of Hanover and made himself master of King George's private fortune. I know that he suppressed the unhappy Poles, that he expatriated the holy orders, including the little sisters, who had won decorations on the field of honor. The Guelphs, the Poles, the Catholics do not worship Bismarck, and for very good reasons, too.

Bismarck forced his gray-haired master, after the war of 1870, to have himself proclaimed Emperor in the very heart of France, thus insulting a prostrate enemy. Bismarck tried to persuade Frederick William to abdicate, simply because he was afraid to lose the Chancellorship.

Bismarck goaded on the present Emperor to intrigues against his dying father. And again, he threw himself at the feet of the Empress Frederick, asking her to avert his dismissal. If one-half of Europe worships Bismarck, the statesman, I say, as a man, he is not great.

LOUISE STRATENUS.

GREATEST STATESMAN OF THE CENTURY.

I think Bismarck was the greatest statesman of the second half of the century. He always had some great purpose in mind and never strove after the unattainable. With other words: He became a great man because he was a man of great energy, a man of sublime courage without being a fanatic. He was the incarnation of power. His physical will being permitted him to do an immense amount of work. His mental capacities made it possible for him to see a great many things at the same time and to observe whether they were worthy of his attention or not. His will power was so great that he was sure of carrying through whatever he undertook.

S. TEN WINKEL,
Professor of Languages at the University of Amsterdam.

SETH LOW ON THE CAUSE OF PREVAILING DISCONTENT.

In an analysis of the development of our civilization during the present century, published in the current issue of the Atlantic, Mr. Seth Low recognizes popular discontent as one of its most significant characteristics.

He says: "Another cause of the prevailing discontent I find in the constant and uprooting changes in life that have been incident to the rapid progress of scientific invention in our day, and from which no class of people have been exempt. The unrest is so general and so world-wide that it is not surprising that men are seeking to find for it some remedy which, by its thoroughness, seems to give promise of a complete cure. Every one is conscious of the new problems, but no one is wise enough to see how they are to be worked out. Men want a universal panacea. Accordingly, the anarchist and the nihilist say that all government, or even society itself, is a failure; that the thing to do is to destroy the foundations of government or of society as they now exist, and to start afresh. The communist, less radical, says that is not at all, but that the institution of property is the source of all trouble. The humanitarian could be introduced, and the people everything in common, then, he thinks, the

BISMARCK'S FALL WAS A GREAT ONE.

Gladstone resigned; Bismarck was dismissed. He had a great fall, because he fell from a great height, but each of them could take a new lease of life from the Almighty without placing their great reputations in jeopardy, for time neither impaired their cleverness nor enfeebled their will power. Bismarck owned immense forests. When he ceased to rule the world he went to govern his hoards. I am convinced that Bismarck might have re-entered upon the duties of Chancellor without a moment's preparation at any time after his dismissal.

JULES SIMON.

HE KNEW WHAT HE WANTED AND GOT IT.

You ask me what I think of Bismarck? It is a big question. He was neither a Cromwell nor a Pitt, but if you could imagine a happy union of the best qualities of each you would go near finding a popular likeness of the Bismarck we know and just the personality we require for England's needs at the present time. Prince Bismarck was a man who knew exactly what he wanted and directed his course straight ahead. What a world of meaning lies in that! If I were to fill pages I could not convey to you the whole of my admiration for Bismarck. As a leader of men he was above all living men. As a man he was altogether lovely for his directness, his honesty and simplicity. If we could only compress some of his moral strength and courage into a bottle and could breathe our statesmen with a minim or so of the wonderful extract, we should soon have reason to be proud of them. As there is no likelihood of our being able to follow up this truly African idea—we must wait until some one will make a textbook of his character for the special benefit of weak kneed and degenerate statesmen—then we may hope that Britain may begin to reap some of the advantages that have made Germany universally respected.

HENRY M. STANLEY.

BISMARCK WAS A SOLDIER.

Like Charlemagne, Alexander the Great and Napoleon, Bismarck belonged to that class of geniuses who, above all were generals endowed with great political and administrative ability. Bismarck was a soldier. He has said so himself. The influence of his mother alone kept him from embracing a military career.

His physical and mental gifts were those of a general; he was a big man, a great worker, a great organizer. Few people possessed anything like his energy. He always was full of courage, always ready to look the enemy in the eye.

Even his commanding, impassionate character, his desire to combine in his person great authority with great responsibilities, his inclination to overwhelm his enemies and to let his will triumph at all hazards, all this proves that Bismarck belonged to that class of giants, half soldiers, half politicians, who are forced by their character to employ physical power as a lever in their political activity.

Bismarck had the head of a Janus; with one face he looked into the future, with another he regarded the past. Only partly did he belong to our modern times; his politics of blood and iron were not for our times. His errors of judgment were as extraordinary as his successes. After a certain date, the politics of blood and iron became unnecessary; they did no longer benefit anybody.

GIUGIELMO FERRERO.

BISMARCK WAS GERMANY'S IRON HAND.

Since Bismarck ceased to rule he had become a great historic figure. Germany had been without power to act, without a right hand, for fifty years. Then came the Iron Chancellor—the iron hand, which gave back to the giant the power of defence and assault.

Bismarck was Germany's savior, but humanity profited little by his actions. He was for Germany what a pair of superfluous, strong spectacles are for a person with weak eyes. It is impossible for me, a Dane, to have a good opinion of Bismarck, who has humbled Denmark.

GEORG BRANDES.

BISMARCK A SCOURGE TO FRANCE.

At the time when Bismarck was endowed with supreme power and when he proved himself a merciless enemy of France, I characterized him as a scourge; my patriotism and my love of humanity dictated what I said then. To-day I have nothing to take back and will not repeat. I don't feel like insulting the dead. I await the judgment of history.

FREDERICK PASSY.

President French Society for International Arbitration.